

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

## CHARLES ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

V.

WASHINGTON STATE SPECIAL  
COMMITMENT CENTER CHIEF  
MEDICAL DIRECTOR, DR. LESLIE  
SIEBERT; WASHINGTON STATE  
SPECIAL COMMITMENT CENTER,  
GALINA DIXON, ARNP, and JOHN  
DOES 1-25 and JANE DOES 1-25,

## Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:15-CV-05555-RJB-DWC

ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO  
PROVIDE COURT WITH  
ADDRESSES

Plaintiff, a Washington State civilly-committed detainee proceeding *pro se*, filed this

<sup>1</sup> On November 27, 2015, Plaintiff filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on August 6, 2015. Dkt. 1.

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff previously filed this action in conjunction with three other civilly-committed detainees. Based upon the allegations in the complaint, the Court determined Plaintiffs' claims did not satisfy the requirements for permissive joinder articulated in Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 20 and 21. *See Mitchell, et. al., v. State of Washington et al.*, 3:15-cv-05226-RBL-DWC, Dkt. 5, 8 (W.D. Wash. 2015). The Court entered an order separating the claims of the four

1 2015, Plaintiff filed a Motion requesting the Court serve a summons and a copy of his complaint  
2 on Defendant Galina Dixon, ARNP. Dkt. 16. However, Plaintiff also names John Does 1-25 and  
3 Jane Does 1-25 (“Doe defendants”) as defendants in this action. The use of “John Doe” to  
4 identify a defendant is not favored. *Gillespie v. Civiletti*, 629 F.2d 637, 642 (9th Cir. 1980).  
5 Although a plaintiff may be given an opportunity after filing a lawsuit to discover the identity of  
6 unknown defendants through discovery, the use of Doe defendants is problematic because those  
7 persons cannot be served with process until they are identified by their real names.<sup>2</sup>

8 Plaintiff is ordered to provide the names and addresses of the Doe defendants within 30  
9 days of the date of this order. If Plaintiff is unable to provide the Court with names and addresses  
10 of the Doe defendants in that timeframe, the Court will recommend dismissal of the Doe  
11 defendants from the case without prejudice.

12 Dated this 14th day of December, 2015.

13   
14

15 David W. Christel  
16 United States Magistrate Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Plaintiffs, ordering Plaintiff Mitchell to file an amended complaint addressing only his individual  
23 claims, and dismissing the other Plaintiffs from the action without prejudice. *Id.*

24 <sup>2</sup> Also, though Plaintiff lists the Doe defendants in the case caption, they are otherwise  
25 unmentioned in the complaint or named in Plaintiff’s causes of action. If Plaintiff is able to  
identify additional defendants and claims through discovery, he may be allowed to amend his  
complaint to add those defendants and claims at that time.